



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/510,911	05/02/2005	Stefan Axelsson	P16321-US1	2070
27045	7590	06/23/2009		
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR 1-C-11 PLANO, TX 75024			EXAMINER REVAK, CHRISTOPHER A	
			ART UNIT 2431	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/23/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/510,911

**Applicant(s)**

AXELSSON, STEFAN

**Examiner**

Christopher A. Revak

**Art Unit**

2431

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) 7-9 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5,6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 2 and 4 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1,3,5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Anderson et al, U.S. Patent 6,021,202.

As per claim 1, it is taught of a method of authentication, wherein a client requests a file from a server, whereby the client and the server share a ~~common~~-secret value and thereby belong to an accepted group, comprising the step of: the client forms a first message including a filename, a nonce which is associated with the giver filename, a first hash value according to a first hash function formed from the filename and the secret value (col. 20, lines 15-32 and col. 21, lines 25-52).

As per claim 3, it is taught wherein the server responds to the request from the client by forming a second message including a file corresponding to the requested filename, the received nonce which is associated with the given filename,

a third hash value according to a second hash function formed from the value of the received nonce and the secret value (col. 21, lines 25-52).

As per claim 5, it is taught wherein the first hash function is the same as the second hash function (col. 21, lines 25-52).

As per claim 6, it is disclosed wherein the inputs to said first hash function are concatenated (col. 21, lines 25-52).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

4. Claims 7-9 are allowed.
5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

As per claim 7, it was not found to be taught in the prior art of a client sharing a secret value with a server, the client and the server thereby belonging to an accepted group, whereby the client forms a first message comprising a filename, a nonce which is associated with the given filename, a first hash value according to a first hash function formed from the values of the filename and the secret value, and whereby the client receives a second message from the server, the client extracting a file of the received second message, extracting a third hash value from the second message, forming a value of the nonce and the secret value, forming a fourth hash value according to a second hash function formed from the value of the nonce associated with the requested filename and the secret value, comparing the third hash value with the fourth hash value and if the values are the same establishing that the second message

stems from a server belonging to the accepted group, and if otherwise, establishing that the server does not belong to the accepted group.

As per claim 8, it was not found to be taught in the prior art of a server sharing a secret value with a client, the client and the server thereby belonging to an accepted group, whereby the server receives a first message from the client, the server extracting a filename and a nonce associated with the filename from the received first message, extracting a first hash value from the received first message, forming a value of the received filename and the secret value, forming a second hash value according to the first hash function formed from the value of the filename and the secret value, comparing the first hash value with the second hash value and if the values are the same establishing that the first message stems from a client belonging to the accepted group, otherwise establishing that the client does not belong to the accepted group.

6. Claims 2 and 4 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher A. Revak whose telephone number is 571-272-3794. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 9:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Korzuch can be reached on 517-272-7589. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christopher A. Revak/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431